REMARKS

The Office Action mailed February 17, 2010 has been reviewed and the following remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to include subject matter from dependent claims 2 and 10, respectively, and to recite that "all DHCP messages communicated between the DHCP client and the DHCP server pass through the DHCP relay located in the Application Layer." Applicants respectfully assert that support for this claim terminology is readily apparent from the application as originally filed. Also, by this Amendment, various minor editorial amendments have been made and claims 14-16 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-13 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Applicants make these claim changes without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants reserve all rights to present claims of the same or similar scope to any of the previously submitted claims, e.g., by filing a continuing application. Nothing in this Amendment should be construed as an admission that Applicants agree with any previous grounds of rejection of the previously presented claims.

Claims Rejected Under 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,884,024 to Lim et al. ("Lim") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,073,178 to Wong et al. ("Wong"). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicants' independent claim 1 recites that the claimed method, among other features, includes filling in at least one field associated with the DHCP relay in the DHCP message for request such that all the DHCP messages for response returned from the DHCP server to the DHCP client for responding to the DHCP message for request pass through the DHCP relay. Lim, on the other hand, discloses "[s]ince DHCP broadcast messages are processed by DHCP relay process 214 prior to being forwarded to DHCP server system 110, DHCP server system 110 is assured that each message of this type will include the correct trusted identifier." See Lim at column 6, lines 19-23. Applicants respectfully assert that this process refers to encoding a trusted identifier into the options field of each DHCP message, and the trusted identifier is used for identifying the client system, not for identifying the DHCP relay agent as described in

Applicants' claim 1. Additionally, Applicants respectfully assert that the object of encoding a trusted identifier is to reduce the IP address misuse among the clients of a DHCP server and to prevent attacking the allocation of IP address using a traditional DHCP server, whereas the object of filling in fields associated with the DHCP relay as recited in Applicants' claim 1 is to make all DHCP messages for response returned from the server to the client pass through the relay.

Applicants respectfully submit that Wong does not overcome the deficiencies of Lim. Applicants respectfully assert that Wong discloses that the router 106 encodes a trusted identifier into the vendor-specific information included in the options field 508 of the DHCPDISCOVER message, forms an association table between the trusted identifier and the IP address when receiving a DHCPACK message, checks the validity of the forwarded data, and notifies the maximum quantity of users allowed access according to the association table. See, for example, Wong at column 7, lines 41-65. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Wong does not describe controlling (and the Wong system does not need to control) all the interactions between the DHCP client and the DHCP server, as this method forms the association table through the initial four interactions.

Moreover, because of their technological differences, Applicants respectfully assert that a person of ordinary skill in this art would not have been motivated to alter the teachings of Lim based on the description in Wong in the manner set forth in the Office Action.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully assert that amended claim 1 stands in condition for allowance over the combination of Lim and Wong. Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 1 discussed above.

Claim 9 recites features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1 and is thus believed to be allowable over the cited references for substantially the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 10-13 each depend from claim 9 and are thus distinguishable for at least these same reasons.

CONCLUSION

If the Examiner believes that an interview will facilitate advancement of the prosecution of this application, he is invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

As noted above, Applicants respectfully request a one (1) month extension of time for responding to the Office Action mailed February 17, 2010, thereby extending the period for response to June 17, 2010. The fees for this extension of time may be charged to the Deposit Account of the undersigned, Deposit Account No. 19-0733. If any additional fees are required to facilitate entry of this Amendment or to maintain the pending status of this application, such as fees under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, please debit Deposit Account No. 19-0733 for any necessary fees. If a further extension of time is needed, such additional extension is hereby requested, and the additional fees may be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-0733.

All rejections having been fully addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for immediate allowance and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

By: /William F. Rauchholz/

William F. Rauchholz
Reg. No. 34,701

1100 13th Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001

Dated: June 14, 2010